

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The following remarks are submitted in response to the office action issued in this case and mailed on July 29, 2003.

Applicants have reviewed carefully the instant office action and applied art, and respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 1-24.

More specifically, Applicants note that the Havel publication fails to bridge the gap between Young and Applicants' invention. Havel fails to teach a device or method that translates the relative brightness of the points created by a full color display into a corresponding brightness for the respective points on a two-color display. Havel merely teaches measuring an input parameter and generating in response thereto, a two or three color variable display. Havel lacks any description of any system or method that translates a measure of relative brightness into anything. Moreover, there is no suggestion in either Young or Havel as to how the device of Havel could be modified to translate a measure of relative brightness on a three color display to a color display having a reduced number of colors, yet this is the explicit subject matter of all pending claims.

Moreover, Applicants respectfully submit that there is no teaching in Young, including the cited figures 1A & 1B, that teach or describe flashing a two color display. This is the subject matter of pending claims 3-5 and 15.

In light of the above, Applicants respectfully request allowance of claims 1-24 so this case may pass to issue.

Conclusion

Applicant believes a fee is due with this response. Please charge our Deposit Account No. 18-1945, under Order No. TBRX-P01-001 from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: January 29, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

By _____

Edward J. Kelly

Registration No.: 38,936
ROPES & GRAY LLP
One International Place
Boston, Massachusetts 02110-2624
(617) 951-7000
(617) 951-7050 (Fax)
Attorneys/Agents For Applicant